

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes a new drawing sheet.

Attachment:        Replacement sheet  
                         Annotated sheet showing changes

### **REMARKS**

The following issues are outstanding in the pending application;

- The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a);
- Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 USC 101 and § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph;
- Claims 2-4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 112;
- Claims 1, 2 and 5 rejected under 35 USC 102;
- Claims 3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103; and
- Claims 4 and 9-11 have been found to be allowable.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

A substitute specification is being submitted in which a new figure, Fig. 7, has been added and in which reference numbers have been added to elements in paragraph [0056]. As a result of the addition of Fig. 7, the paragraphs have been renumbered. A clean copy and a marked up copy of the substitute specification is found in the Appendix to the Amendment. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

### **Claim Amendments**

The claims have been amended in which the allowable subject matter of claim 9 has been added to independent claims 1 and 6. New claims 16-18 have been added in which claim 16 includes the subject matter of claims 1 and 10, claim 17 includes the subject matter of claims 1 and 4 and claim 18 includes the subject matter of claims 6 and 10. Claims 4, 8-10 and 12-15 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

### **Drawing Objection**

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The feature of a pressure roller disposed opposite and plane parallel to the supporting table in claim 4 and the opposing pressure roller

of claim 11 are not shown in the drawings. New Fig. 7 showing this feature is being submitted with this response. Support for this feature is found in paragraph [0056] of the substitute specification being submitted with this response.

35 USC 101 and § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph

Claims 6-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 because the subject matter is directed to neither a “machine” nor a “process.” Independent claims 6 and 11 have been amended to clarify that these claims are directed to a machine. Claims 6-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as being indefinite. Independent claims 6 and 11 have been amended to overcome this rejection.

35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph

Claims 2-4 and 6-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as being indefinite. The subject matter of claims 2-4, 6, 9 and 11 has been amended to overcome the rejections of each of these claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for suggesting appropriate corrections.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as having subject matter anticipated by JP 3-158227 to Miura. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The allowable subject matter of claim 9 has been added to independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome. Claims 2 and 5 depend at least in part from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 under 35 USC 102 as having subject matter anticipated by JP 3-158227 to Miura.

35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as having subject matter unpatentable over Miura in view of U.S. 3,454,450 to Tyrrell. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that the previous discussion of the patentability of independent claim 1 over Miura obviates the present rejection of claim 3. Tyrrell adds no new teaching to this reference that would result in the inventive method of amended independent claim 1 and 3. If an independent claim is nonobvious over 35 USE 103, then any claim depending therefrom is by definition nonobvious. *In re Fine* 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Regarding independent claim 6, the allowable subject matter of claim 9 has been added to independent claim 6. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome. Claim 7 now depends from new independent claim 14 which is allowable. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, than any claim depending therefrom is by definition non-obvious. *In re Fine* 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 3, 6 and 7 under 35 USC 103 as having subject matter unpatentable over Miura in view of U.S. 3,454,450 to Tyrrell.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2375, under Order No. HO-P03085US0 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: Jan 11 - 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jan K. Simpson

Registration No. 33,283

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

Fulbright Tower

1301 McKinney, Suite 5100

Houston, Texas 77010-3095

(713) 651-5151

(713) 651-5246 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments